

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,358	09/28/2004	Masao Komai	KOMAI5	2011
1444 7	590 10/31/2005		EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW			KOEHLER, ROBERT R	
SUITE 300	11021,111		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20001-5303		1775	

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/509,358	KOMAI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert R. Koehler	1775				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	SS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was precised to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir  will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
•	action is non-final.		•			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar			erits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
. 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.	•		•			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-	152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.					
<del>-</del> · · · ·	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
·	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
RRK.						
10-26-05						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I	ate Patent Application (PTO-1	52)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09282004; 03292005</u> .	6) Other:	•				

Application/Control Number: 10/509,358

Art Unit: 1775

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because (a) the proper units for surface area are not stated in line 7 of the abstract and (b) the mole ratio given in line 5 of the abstract should state "lithium hydroxide" instead of "lithium silicate." The Examiner notes that "lithium silicate" is prepared by mixing particular molar ratios of silicic acid or silicate with lithium hydroxide. See lines 5 to 11 on page 3 of the specification and claim 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/ § 103(a)

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/509,358

Art Unit: 1775

Evaluations of the level of ordinary skill in the art requires consideration of such factors as various prior art approaches, types of problems encountered in the art, rapidity with which innovations are made, sophistication of technology involved, educational background of those actively working in the field, commercial success, and failure of others.

The "person having ordinary skill" in this art has the capability of understanding the scientific and engineering principles applicable to the claimed invention. The evidence of record including the references and/or admissions are considered to reasonably reflect this level of skill.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,169,916 (Tsutsui, et al.).

Tsutsui, et al. discloses a method of coating a steel sheet with a solution that contains at least one or more of water soluble or water dispersible lithium silicates which are prepared from silicic acid or a silicate and a lithium salt such as lithium hydroxide. Tsutsui, et al. prefers that the lithium silicate is water soluble or dispersible and is prepared from a mixture of silicic acid or silicate and a lithium salt in a molar ratio of 20:1 to 1:1. The patent mentions the usage of a lithium silicate solution having a concentration in the range of from 2 to 250 g/l, and the thickness of a treated lithium silicate film is mainly controlled by the concentration of the lithium silicate solution. Hence, the lithium silicate coating becomes thicker in proportion to the increasing concentration of the lithium silicate solution. Tsutsui, et al. states that the application of a lithium compound onto a steel substrate produces a strong coating film which enhances the forming operation of a steel sheet. Hence, Tsutsui, et al. discloses a useful property of lubrication by solid lithium silicate films for the forming operations of steel sheets. See line 16 in column 2 to line 10 in column 3, lines 27 to 35 in column 3, and lines 1 to 13 in column 4. Although Tsutsui, et al. is silent as to the usage of solid lithium silicate films on a bearing seal made from surface-treated steel sheet, this useful lubrication property by solid

Application/Control Number: 10/509,358

Art Unit: 1775

lithium silicate is inherent to a bearing seal made from a steel sheet coated with a solid lithium silicate film because Tsutsui, et al. discloses the usage of lithium silicate solutions as a means for providing suitable lubrication during the forming operations of steel sheets. See lines 16 to 28 in column 2.

In addition, the presently claimed bearing seal prepared by using a steel sheet treated with a lithium silicate film would obviously have been present once the Tsutsui, et al. product is provided. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977), as to the providing of this rejection made above under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Robert Koehler whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1536**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones, can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The official Fax No. is (571) 273-8300, and the After-Final Fax No. is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

ROBERT R. KOEHLER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1775 October 26, 2005